

ED 403 620

CS 509 418

AUTHOR Ratcliff, Linnea; And Others
 TITLE The Impact of Videotaping on the Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Competency of Low Apprehensive Students.
 PUB DATE Nov 96
 NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (82nd, San Diego, CA, November 23-26, 1996).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Persuasive Discourse; *Public Speaking; *Self Concept; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Undergraduate Students; *Videotape Recordings
 IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Teacher Student Conferences

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effects of videotaping in a public speaking program. Hypotheses were that (1) communication apprehension is negatively related to self-perceived communication competency and (2) low communication apprehensive subjects will show less self-perceived communication competency on a subsequent speech if, during a conference with their teacher, they first view a videotape of themselves delivering a speech. Subjects were 71 undergraduate students enrolled in 3 sections of the basic public speaking course at a midwestern university. Uniformity in approach, syllabus, number and type of speech assignments, and critiquing format were maintained. Subjects were required to give four prepared speeches. Communication apprehension (CA) was measured by the public speaking component of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24), completed by subjects prior to delivering each of the four speeches, and the Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency Scale (SPPSC) was used to measure self-perceived competence. Results indicated that an average of 11 students (15%) were categorized as high CAs, an average of 17 students (24%) were low CAs, and an average of 43 students (61%) were moderate CAs. Findings revealed that all comparisons proved significant in confirming the first hypothesis, but the second hypothesis was not confirmed. (Contains 33 references.) (CR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

The Impact of Videotaping on the
Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Competency
of Low Apprehensive Students

Linnea Ratcliff, Ph.D.
Glenda Clyde, Ph.D.
Barry Poyner, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Ratcliff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Speech Communication Association
1996 Convention
San Diego, California November 23-26, 1996

CS509418

The Impact of Videotaping on the Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Competency of Low Apprehensive Students

For a number of years the authors have been researching the effects of videotaping in the public speaking classroom. Our findings confirm that when a student anticipates being videotaped his/her communication apprehension (CA) does not significantly increase over that of students who have no such anticipation. Interested in the after-effects of videotaping, our research reported on self-reported student apprehension while delivering speeches subsequent to the one that was videotaped (Ratcliff, Clyde and Poyner, 1996). "All moderate CAs, whether or not they were videotaped, decreased their level of apprehension from speech one to speech four" (p.5). The most unexpected and perhaps most interesting finding was that videotaped low CA students had higher levels of CA on speeches subsequent to the one videotaped when compared to low CA students who had not been videotaped and moderate CAs who had been videotaped. The current study is an attempt to understand why low CAs showed higher levels of apprehension after they had been videotaped than did low CA students who had not been videotaped or moderate CAs who had been videotaped.

Literature relating to high CA is growing rapidly. High CA has been negatively linked theoretically and empirically to social, academic and communication performance. High CA demands our attention. Research relating to the specific variables of our research question is less prolific. It is understandable that research relating specifically to low communication apprehension is minimal. Occasionally we glean information about low CA as a point of contrast in research directed at high CA. Often this has been in the form of inference.

Few studies have explored patterns of apprehension during a course of instruction in public speaking. McCroskey (1978) cited two unpublished studies which indicated significant changes in levels of apprehension during a course of instruction in public speaking. One study "...varied the number of speeches from none to seven, and found significant differences among some of the conditions" (p.201). The second "found significant changes over a semester's time in the students' communication apprehension level based upon an interaction of extroversion and the type of criticism" (p.201). Literature focusing on students with high CA suggests that "completing a public speaking course is likely to be a punishing experience for high CA students" (Ellis, 1995, p.67). Foss (1982) echoes that conclusion suggesting that highly anxious students "may be hurt rather than helped by required oral presentations" (p.200). No studies were found that examined changes in students' apprehension levels subsequent to being videotaped.

Studies investigating students' self-ratings after they viewed a videotape of themselves delivering a speech found that these ratings showed more correspondence with the instructor's ratings than before they viewed the videotape (Dieker, Crane & Brown, 1971; Roberts, 1972). Furthermore, Ayres (1986) suggests that "the more one's perceived communication ability falls below one's perception of others' expectations in a given public speaking situation, the higher one's level of stage fright" (p.277). It is possible that because of the videotaping experience low CA students are more aware of the teacher's expectations and the extent to which they did not meet those expectations. These factors could lead to increased apprehension on subsequent speeches.

Other variables which might explain higher levels of CA among low CA students subsequent to being videotaped are those relating to self-perceived communication competency. Rubin, Graham and Mignerey (1990) found that "communication apprehension (CA) was related to perceptions of communication competence" (p. 2). Numerous studies have focused on this relationship (Rubin, Graham, & Mignerey, 1990; Chesebro, McCroskey, & Atwater, 1992; Rosenfeld, Grant, & McCroskey, 1995; Ellis, 1995). Consistent with these studies, Ellis found a significant negative relationship between anxiety and self-perceived competency at each of three test times (1995). These studies raise the question: do videotaped low CAs have less self-perceived communication competency on subsequent speeches than do low CAs who are not videotaped?

Thomas, Tymon and Thomas (1994) give further insight into this question in their discussion of interpretive styles such as "deficiency focusing" and "envisioning success." "Deficiency focusing" is "the tendency to focus upon what is wrong when evaluating one's performance" (p. 312). They found that an individual's level of CA is increased by greater "deficiency focusing." "This finding suggests that CA can be understood, at least in part, as a variable that increases directly with the tendency to think about oral communication tasks in terms of what can go wrong, what is going wrong, and what is wrong with oneself as a communicator" (p. 323). "Envisioning success," on the other hand, is the tendency to have positive images about future task outcomes. The authors found that CA is decreased by greater "envisioning success" (p. 322). Based on this research we might infer that low CAs engage in "envisioning success." Limited research on low CAs offers some support for this position. Low CAs have more positive thoughts and are considerably more task-focused (Ayes, 1988; Daly & Lawrence, 1985; Daly, Vangelisti, Neel and Cavanaugh, 1989). As a result of viewing their videotaped speech in conjunction with a teacher conference, low CAs may use more "deficient focusing" increasing apprehension which in turn decreases self-perceived communication competency.

Based on the literature it is hypothesize that:

H1: Communication apprehension is negatively related to self-perceived communication competency.

H2: Low CAs, who during a conference with the teacher view a videotape of themselves delivering a speech, will show less self-perceived communication competency on a subsequent speech.

Method

Participants were 71 undergraduate students enrolled in three sections of the basic public speaking course at a midwest university. Uniformity in approach, syllabus, number and type of speech assignments, and critiquing format were maintained. All students were required to give four prepared speeches. Each student was videotaped while delivering the second of four speeches. Following speech two and before speech three the student and instructor viewed and discussed the videotaped speech. During the conference the critique form was also reviewed and goals for future speeches were discussed. The conference took place in the instructor's office and lasted approximately fifteen min-

utes. Students who were not videotaped were given a written critique following their speech. No teacher conference was held with these students. Communication apprehension was measured by the public speaking component of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24), a Likert-like, self-report instrument designed to measure oral communication apprehension in four contexts: dyadic, meeting, group and public speaking (McCroskey, 1982a). The reliability and validity of the PRCA as a measure of communication apprehensiveness is well established (McCroskey & Beatty, 1984; Beatty, 1987; Beatty, Balfantz, & Kuwabara, 1989; Beatty & Andriate, 1985; Beatty & Friedland, 1990). Numerous studies (Beatty, Forst & Stewart, 1986; McCroskey, Fayer & Richmond, 1986) have used the six-item public speaking component of the PRCA prior to an actual speaking performance as a measure of CA. The six items are:

I have no fear of giving a speech; Certain parts of my body feel tense and rigid while giving a speech; I feel very relaxed while giving a speech; My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech; I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence, and while giving a speech I get so nervous I forget the facts I really know.

The Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency Scale (SPPSC) was used to measure self-perceived competence (Ellis, 1995). "The SPPSC is a 5-step, Likert-type self-report measure developed by Ellis. "The eight is based on the eight public speaking competencies identified on the Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form recently devised by the SCA-assigned task force of the Committee on Assessment and Testing" (Morreale, 1990).

Students completed the public speaking component of the PRCA-24 prior to delivering each of four speeches. The SPPSC was completed by each student prior to the delivery of speech one and prior to the delivery of speech three.

Results

Students were categorized as having high CA if their scores on the public speaking component of the PRCA were at or above one standard deviation above the mean. Students were categorized as low CA if their scores on the six-item PRCA were at or below one standard deviation below the mean. All other students were categorized as moderate CA. The PRCA mean for all students across all speeches was 18.94. An average of 11 students (15%) were categorized as high CAs. An average of 17 students (24%) fell into the low CA category; and an average of 43 students (61%) were determined to be moderate CAs.

In order to test the first hypothesis, the SPPSC means of high CAs, moderate CAs and low CAs were compared using ANOVA. Self-perceived communication competency was the dependent measure. Significance was found at the .05 level. In order to determine which of the variables accounted for the difference between groups, t-tests were run between variables. The .05 level was set to determine significance. Table 1 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Table 1
Comparison of CA Group Means
on the SPPSC for Speech One

	N	X	SD	F	T
<u>Speech 1</u>					
HCA	11	54.91	5.82	50	2.35*
MCA	41	49.68	6.57		
LCA	11	43.82	3.85	50	2.77*
HCA	11	54.91	5.82	20	5.02*

*p<.05

All of the comparisons proved significant confirming the first hypothesis. Communication apprehension is negatively related to self-perceived communication competency.

The second hypothesis was tested by submitting means of all groups of low CAs to ANOVA. Self-perceived Communication competency was the dependent measure. The between groups consisted of two conditions, video and nonvideo, times two speeches. Table 3 indicates the results of the analysis.

Table 2
ANOVA for Low CAs in Two Conditions
on the SPPSC for Speeches One and Three

	D.F.	Sum. Sqs.	X Sqs.	F	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	844.45	422.22	2.19	.86*
Within Groups	25	4816.51	192.66		
Total	27	5660.96			

*Not significant

The second hypothesis was not confirmed. Low CAs who, during a conference with the teacher viewed a videotape of themselves delivering a speech, did not show less self-perceived communication competency on a subsequent speech.

Discussion

This study reinforces previous research findings that indicate communication apprehension is inversely related to self-perceived communication competency. The current study extends the finding to specific categories of apprehensiveness: high, moderate and low. The average self-perceived communication competency of high CAs was lower than the average self-perceived communication competency of moderate CAs which in turn was lower than that of low CAs as a group.

Low CAs in this study did increase their level of CA subsequent to the videotape experience. This was true when compared to nonvideo taped low CAs and the pattern of videotaped moderate CAs. This was the same pattern found in an earlier study by the authors (Ratcliff, Clyde and Poyner). In the current study, however, the higher level of CA did not reach the level of significance. The sample for this study was relatively

small. When the current data are combined with earlier data the higher level of apprehension remains significant.

This study does not confirm that a higher level of CA experienced by low CAs following a videotape experience is accompanied by a change in their self-perceived communication competency, leaving unexplained the higher level of CA for low CAs after videotaping. If a decrease in self-perceived communication competency doesn't account for the higher communication apprehension, what does? The literature suggests a path for future research. Numerous studies discuss the relationship between trait and situational CA (Ayres, 1990). It is possible that self-perceived communication competency accounts for a person's trait apprehension whereas "deficiency focusing" (Thomas, Tymon and Thomas) is a situational variable for low CAs under the circumstances described in the study.

References

- Ayres, J. (1986). Perceptions of Speaking Ability: An Explanation for Stage Fright. Communication Education, 35, 275-287.
- Ayres, J., Ayres, F.E., Baker, A.L., Colby, N., DeBlasi, C., Dimke, D., Docken, L., Grubb, J., Hopf, T., Mueller, R.D., Sharp, D., & Wilcox, A.K. (1993). Two Empirical Tests of a Videotape Designed to Reduce Public Speaking Anxiety. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21, 132-147.
- Beatty, M.J. (1987). Communication Apprehension as a Determinant of Avoidance, Withdrawal and Performance Anxiety. Communication Quarterly, 35, 202-217.
- Beatty, M. (1988). Public Speaking Apprehension, Decision-Making Errors in the Selection of Speech Introduction Strategies and Adherence to Strategy. Communication Education, 37, 297-311.
- Beatty, M.J., Andriate, G.S. (1985). Communication Apprehension and General Anxiety in the Prediction of Public Speaking Anxiety. Communication Quarterly, 33, 174-184.
- Beatty, M.J., Balfantz, G.L., & Kuwabara, A.Y., (1989). Trait-like Qualities of Selected Variables Assumed to be Transient Causes of Performance State Anxiety. Communication Education, 38, 277-289.
- Beatty, M.J., Forst, E.C., & Stewart, R.A. (1986). Communication Apprehension and Motivation as Predictors of Public Speaking Duration. Communication Education, 35, 143-146.
- Beatty, M.J. & Friedland, M.H. (1990). Public Speaking State Anxiety as a Function of Selected Situational and Predispositional Variables. Communication Education, 39, 142-147.
- Bourhis, J. & Allen, M. (1992). Meta-analysis of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Cognitive Performance. Communication Education, 41, 68-76.
- Bush, J.D., Bittner, J.R., & Brooks, W.D. (1972). The Effects of the Video-tape Recorder on Levels of Anxiety, Exhibitionism, and Reticence. Speech Teacher, 21, 127-130.
- Cronin, M.W., Grice, G.L., & Olsen, R.K. (1994). The Effects of Interactive Video Instruction in Coping with Speech Fright. Communication Education, 43, 42-53.
- Daly, J.A. & Friedrich G. (1981). The Development of Communication Apprehension: A Retrospective Analysis of Contributory Correlates. Communication Quarterly, 29, 243-255.
- Deihl, E.R., Breen, M.P., & Larson, C.U. (1970). The Effects of Teacher Comments and Television Videotape Playback on the Frequency of Nonfluency in Beginning Speech Students. Speech Teacher, 19, 185-189.
- Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, Self-perceived Competency, and Teacher Immediacy in the Laboratory-Supported Public Speaking Course: Trends and Relationships. Communication Education, 44, 64-78.
- Ericson, P.M. & Gardner J.W. (1992). Two Longitudinal Studies of Communication Apprehension and Its Effects on College Students' Success. Communication Quarterly, 40, 127-137.
- Fass, K.A. (1982). Communication Apprehension; Resources for the Instructor. Communication Education, 31, 195-204.

- Hirschfield, A.G. (1966). Utilization of Video-taped Speeches for Self-Analysis in Fundamentals of Speech Course. Speech Monographs, 33, 227.
- Hoyt, J.L. (1977). Courtroom Coverage: The Effects of Being Televised. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 21, 487-495.
- Jordan, W.J. & Powers, W.G. (1978). Verbal Behavior as a Function of Apprehension and Social Context. Human Communication Research, 4, 294-300.
- Lake, R.L. & Adams, W.C. (1984). Effects of the Videotape Recorder on Levels of Anxiety, Exhibitionism and Reticence in High School Speech Students. Communication Education, 33, 333-336.
- Lashbrook, W.B., Lashbrook, V.J., Bacon, C., & Salinger S. (1979). An Empirical Examination of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Tolerance of Ambiguity. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 44, 244-251.
- Lustig, M.W. & King S.W. (1980). The Effect of Communication Apprehension and Situation on Communication Strategy Choices. Human Communication Research, 7, 74-82.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1982a). An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1970). Measures of Communication--Bound Anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1982b). Oral Communication Apprehension: A Reconceptualization. Communication Yearbook, 6, 136-170.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-93.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an Index of Oral Communication Apprehension. Communication Monographs, 45, 193-203.
- McCroskey, J.C., Booth-Butterfield, S., & Payne, S.K. (1989). The Impact of Communication Apprehension on College Student Retention and Success. Communication Quarterly, 37, 100-101, 104-105.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Lashbrook, W.B. (1970). The Effect of Various Methods of Employing Video-taped Television Playback in a Course in Public Speaking. Speech Teacher, 19, 199-205.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Richmond, V.P. (1977). Communication Apprehension as a Predictor of Self-Disclosure. Communication Quarterly, 25, 40-43.
- Nelson, H.E. (1968). Instructional Uses of Videotape: A Symposium. Speech Teacher, 17, 101-122.
- Roberts, C. (1972). The Effects of Self-Confrontation, Role Playing, and Response Feedback on the Level of Self-Esteem. Communication Education, 21, 22-38.
- Rubin, R.B., Graham, E.E., & Mignerey, J.T. (1990). A Longitudinal Study of College Students' Communication Competence. Communication Education, 39, 1-14.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (1996) <i>THE IMPACT OF VIDEOTAPING ON the Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Competency of Low Apprehensive Students</i>	
Author(s): * <i>Ratcliff, Clyde, and Payner</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: Nov. 23-26, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE: * *One author's signature is sufficient.*

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents



Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2



Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→
please

Signature: <i>Linnear Ratcliff</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>LINNEA RATCLIFF / Professor</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Truman State University</i>	Telephone: <i>(816) 785-4489</i>	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: <i>LL09@Truman.Ed</i>	Date: <i>2/26/97</i>

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Requisitions
ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility~~

~~1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598~~

~~Telephone: 301-497-4080~~

~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~

~~FAX: 301-953-0263~~

~~e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~

~~WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~